

APPENDIX A. Comments on the proposed TCF addition to Garrity Mountain WMA EA received by FWP.  
(Comments received via E = email, M = mail.)

Com- men- ter #	Via	Para- graph	Comment
1	E		I support the proposed acquisition provided FWP authorizes wolf trapping on the Garrity Mtn WMA as part of the recreational use.
2	E		After reading the Garrity Mtn WMA-EA I see no reason not to proceed with this purchase. I think it will be a great addition to the existing WMA.
3	E		I support FWP's acquisition of this property!
4	E	1	I support this addition to the Garrity Mtn WMA.
		2	I recreate around this property frequently, I have seen Elk, Moose, Bear, both Whitetail and Mule Deer, and Antelope in this area.
		3	I have also heard wolves howl, and found wolf kills in years past.
		4	This is a very important winter range for all these animals.
5	E		I personally am in favor of FWP buying this land. The bank was the previous owner and not allowing hunting on it because of liability issues. Many people would benefit from this purchase I believe. Since it borders the refuge area, it's logical to buy this land and expand the area.
6	E		I am supportive of the purchase. I am just concerned that the public often pays more than these properties would bring on the open market. Then we own it, but there is no funding to manage it. Such as treating weeds and or other potential purchases can't happen because we blow the funding on overpriced purchases.
7	M	1	Totally in favor of this purchase--what a great piece of property for habitat.
		2	Only disappointment is yet another locked gate with walk-in capabilities only.
		3	As we age, we need access (limited).
		4	I know an open roadway would be abused by 4-wheelers and irresponsible persons, but we need to find a solution to all these gated, "Open to Everyone" state lands.
8	M	1	In support of the Garrity Mountain WMA addition, I would like to comment on how important this piece of property is to the elk herd in area 214 HD [Hunting District]. As a life-long resident I have observed these elk every winter for the last 40 years. This property is their winter range. When the snow gets deep, these southern exposure ridges provide the feed these elk require. They are also quite an attraction for many wildlife observers when they feed on the northern exposure. I have seen as many as 361 elk wintering on it. In the spring the cows stay and calve in the aspens before moving west to Garrity Mountain.
		2	This property should remain roadless to protect the grasses that are so crucial to many kinds of wildlife--deer (white-tailed and mule) and even antelope. Last summer there were 4 antelope on it. Please consider adding this parcel to the wildlife management area.
9	M	1	I attended the public meeting at the Metcalf Center in Anaconda. I wish and I am greatly in favor of this piece of land going into public habitat. The presentation by your representatives was very well presented.
		2	My only comment is that I wish the "plan" would allow tree cutting--especially of the dead and beetle-kill variety. Thinning and cleaning the forest floor will "reroute" the wildlife only for a short time. They'll be back.
10	E		Pintler Ranger District (See page A-2)
11	M	1	I cannot understand why there will be no motorized access to "Garrity Mountain" WMA.
		2	You people are creating wilderness areas without Congressional approval.
		3	Wasting all of that money on locks and gates isn't right.
		4	You must be saving these WMAs for the rich out of states.
		5	It won't make much difference anyway. Your wolf management ideas are not working.
		6	Wolves are nothing but vermin. Better get rid of them before all the game is gone.



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Beaverhead-Deerlodge  
National Forest  
Pintler Ranger District

88 Business Loop  
Philipsburg, MT 59858  
406 859-3211

---

File Code: 2610

Date: August 29, 2014

Randy Arnold  
Regional Supervisor  
Region 2 Fish Wildlife and Parks  
3201 Spurgin Road  
Missoula, MT 59804

Dear Mr. Arnold:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Garrity Mountain Wildlife Management Area (July 31, 2014). I support the proposed acquisition of 640 acres by FWP. This area is not only an important winter range for elk, but is important for a diverse set of wildlife species.

Although the Pintler Ranger District does not directly adjoin this property, it is adjacent to the Garrity Mtn. WMA on the west side. Noxious weed management and spread is a concern we share. We support the non-motorized seasonal use and noxious weed management proposed for this property once FWP has ownership.

If you have any questions please contact Anne Roberts at 406-494-0238.

Sincerely,

/s/ Charlene F. Bucha  
CHARLENE F. BUCHA  
District Ranger

A-2



## **Appendix B:**

### **Public Meeting for Proposed Addition to Garrity Mountain WMA**

Held at Anaconda (Metcalf Memorial Senior Citizen Center),  
14 August 2014 (7 to 9 p.m.)  
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP)

#### **Public Testimony** (Comments are summarized from a recording of the public testimony)

*NOTE: ellipses . . . used where portion/s of tape was inaudible*

##### **1. Chris Marchion (start @ 0:09<sup>1</sup>)**

- Took us a long time to put this together, since back when Jim Brickley owned it there was an interest; it's been difficult process.
- Want to thank 2 people: American Bank who took possession under foreclosure & for hanging in there; Dick Walter was good to work with; they deserve a lot of credit. And thank The Conservation Fund [TCF] for purchasing this land and hanging onto it until state ownership could occur--they trusted that this process would work out (since they didn't purchase w/ intent to make \$ or own the property long-term). And thank Brickley for originally bringing this proposal to us and getting it on the map.
- Relative to timber harvest: there's a lot of dead aspen and beetle-kill lodgepole. It's a liability if we don't do something to reduce the fuel load.
- From access standpoint off Stumptown Road, it's appropriate. But there's another access road that is County and through Dennis Washington's land. Best way to hunt this land is from this other road, but problem w/ no easy parking along the road except in 3 people's backyards. Encourage FWP to build a little parking lot to help. This needs to be addressed.
- Thanks to Ray Vinkey, Mike Thompson and Dave Dziak of FWP for making this happen and for the work & maintenance they'll have to do in the future. Also weeds are an immediate need.
- Good wildlife habitat, close to Anaconda, it's a great piece of property and it's going to be well used. Our sportsmen's group would like to help out where needed.

##### **2. Terry Galle (start @ 5:26)**

- I live on the other side; I'm not for or against [the proposal]; I'm only here because Garrity Mtn . . . .
- Issues we have in Anaconda are huge; we live in the largest Super Fund site in state of Montana. There's no land we can actually purchase east of that. We live in the canyon and that's it; the

---

<sup>1</sup> "Start @ X:XX" = the time counter in **minutes:seconds** on the recording, where this person's comments begin.

land that we have left is right around here. We have no place to build, no place to go. Those are things we need to take into consideration before we make a decision on this--before we start to purchase more land.

- Used to be able to hunt anywhere. Once the state takes over the land, . . . there's gates everywhere.
- And I think the biggest thing, truthfully, is . . . where are we going to go; we're going to go west if we go anywhere.
- I live in Lost Creek, got people shooting down by your house every day. Elk . . . Have had people on the hillside looking down on my house, shooting at us. Scary thing.
- Access needs to be for everybody; not just for the people who can walk. Until you have a handicapped person in your family, you don't know what it's like. I have a handicapped son, he drives a wheelchair that's a 4-wheeler. Lot of people don't like that--but tough! That's the way he gets around now, the only way. It's very difficult. They have access places in the state of Montana. . . drive . . .
- I think if we, the state of Montana is going to buy this land, it needs to be for everybody, not just for the people who can walk.
- . . . and a lot of you guys are older than I am.
- It should still be accessible to 4-wheelers, and I don't want to see any gates.
- You guys [FWP] went up Lost Creek this last summer and put a gate up the trail that goes up Spring Gulch all the way to the top of the valley. That's got an easement on it. Why do you guys [FWP] think you can put a gate on that? I don't think that's fair. I'm not from California, I'm from Montana; I was born and raised here.
- Don't want to see a bunch of gates; I just can't stand it. I see a sign and these kids hanging it up.... Just my opinion.
- Another thing I wanted to say. Cattle[?] . . . Lost Creek, kids from Lost Creek kept that cow . . . Forest Service . . . burned down. So you guys tell me, who's the best guy to manage the property?
- So if we turn it over to the state, we'll have no way to grow our community; our community needs to grow. I'd like my sons to be close to dad. What of grandkids, I don't see any future for them. It's a scary time we're in.
- [inaudible]
- Thank you; and I'm not against this, but I'm not for it.

### 3. Leo Jense (start @ 10:20)

- I can see property from my house; I disagree with Terry [Galle] 100%.
- You see development, but I don't want to see houses over there. It's just sick, they take every mountain top. And who's going to be up there--the super rich. [Someone interrupts him and there's a short back/forth of words]
- We don't need a lot more people; I don't like a lot of people, and if we had that we'd have access. That's the only thing we have left in Anaconda. The company had everything. When I was a kid, you could go anywhere you want. But now try to get out of town. Where can you go?

- This is going to be one access and anyone--a child, a kid, a family--can go up there. They're going to appreciate it.
- I hope this project goes through; I support it 100%

#### **4. Dave Stone (start @ 11:31)**

- I'm an adjacent property owner from this parcel. Have observed elk on this parcel last 40 years (saw 361 back in about 1992), also deer, saw antelope last year; but wolves have depleted elk numbers somewhat
- This property is as low as the elk can come; they have no other place to go but everything else is getting developed. This is the last place near Anaconda that these elk have to go.
- It's such a great recreational opportunity for Anaconda folks to drive a mile and park, and walk--for miles--all the way to behind Garrity Mountain if you want.
- I'm against motorized travel in there; if you put motorized on this property, the elk will be gone.
- This is a prime building area near Anaconda; don't want to see this area developed
- Guy that bought land below me is going to put a llama ranch in there. He put a woven wire fence in last year that the elk tore down, so he turned radio on full blast all night long to keep elk out. Now he's put up a big yard light. This is what happens to the elk; they keep getting harassed.
- I commend you Ray and everyone working on this; good job!

#### **5. Bob Andreozzi ( start @ 14:16)**

- I'm here to speak in favor of this proposal.
- I think this is a jewel of a property; I look at this property morning, noon and night. I see it through the season, and I see its importance to the elk. Overjoyed to see the potential for this property to go into FWP ownership. Just like I was when the Anaconda watershed property went back to the Forest Service.
- Property has so many good points to it, especially in wintertime. I see the elk in there; it is one of the few places they have, when the snow blows off the ridges, you can see them congregate there. It's really vital to their well-being.
- I'd like to comment on what Chris [Marchion] said. My profession was forestry. From what I've seen of that property, beetles did go through there and kill trees. He's right--there will be fuel load in there.
- Also problem of when those trees fall over; they might restrict some movement.
- I've watched over the years; being a forester; learned a bit about aspen ecology. Aspen over there has a leafroller [insect damage], and I've seen it kill a fair number of trees. We've had little epidemics every now and then.
- Aspen is fire-or disaster/disturbance-oriented species. Has underground rhizomes--all genetically similar, called clones. Disturbance is how they spread; it's what they need to keep healthy. Sometimes Forest Service is pretty darn good in burning areas; trouble is those aspen sprouts come up and they're so tasty that cows, deer, elk, anything that can is going to eat it. It . . . can't protect itself.

- Long-term you're probably going to have to look at some kind of management for that aspen. As Ray said earlier, aspen is in decline overall in western US. So I'd look at the mgmt of the aspen long-term.
- Recreation aspects are wonderful. I just love to go in that area, picnic, hike, until I get too old. Such a great area; would be really upset if it was ever subdivided and homes put in there. It's just beautiful habitat.

**FWP Bob White (start @ 17:59)**

- I 'm a fire guy; worked with you [and?] DNRC in Missoula, so my answer to everything is burn.
- I have a question for Bob Andreozzi: Do you think that if fire was run through those aspen groves and wildlife moving in and eating those younger trees, it would be more detrimental for restoring those aspen?

**5. Andreozzi ( start @ 18:30)**

- Based on # of elk that go in there, it's something that has to be considered. Maybe fencing off those areas or something is needed; it gets so heavily used in there; also by deer. It could be a problem with regenerating, say, through fire.

**FWP Ray Vinkey (FWP; start @ 18:54)**

- That is something that we looked at. Aspen regeneration is good in there right now, but it's definitely a disturbance-oriented species and that's something that FWP could definitely look at in the future. Right now there's [inaudible].

**6. Gary Loshesky (start @ 19:33)**

- I live on north Cable Road, I look at this every day and appreciate it, and I think wouldn't it be great if it were in the public's domain.
- Let me ask a question: What's the chances of this purchase not going through?

**FWP Vinkey (start @ 19:56)**

- I don't feel it's appropriate for me to wager on that.

**6. Loshesky (start @ 20:00)**

- [inaudible] comments about it; concerned about it . . . ; trying to support a cause . . . ; good for everyone

**FWP Vinkey (start @ 20:12)**

- One of hardest things to achieve is to fund a project like this, and we have funding in hand. We have very strong public support. Those are key features the FW Commission is going to look at. So I'd say in those respects the project's very possible.

**6? Loshesky? (start @ 20:33)**

- OK; I'm totally in support of the project; love it.
- I just have concerns about access. How many young people are in here tonight? What's the age? I see one young guy over there. Everybody else is old guys, we're old people.
- Access . . . by that church. Used to be able to get within 2 miles of Hearst Lake. Gate . . . How many of you walk to the lake? [One person says, "I don't."] I can't; my knees are bad. I think we need to have some sort of access at least from one point through that area.
- Levengood Gulch access; it's 1½ miles up to there from the pavement. Only see young people up there; I don't see young people at this meeting.
- There should be access further on the road to get up to the property for us old people, us "right here [tonight] people." We need some access to get into that back country; just one way--that's all we're asking for.
- Young people, parties; I pick up the trash from North Cable Road.
- Where are the young people, they're not at this meeting; you're making it accessible for them, but not us.
- Again, love the project; but we need access

**FWP Vinkey (start @ 23:57)**

- FWP doesn't plan on any specific handicapped access.
- Since you asked, I want to clarify about access to Hearst Lake--It goes through Mountain Line property and . . . which is east by Anaconda-Deer Lodge County property; does not go through this [TCF] property. There's a loop road that you can get through this property high up the Hearst Lake Road. But this property isn't on the mainline.
- So those comments about getting to Hearst Lake itself are really more pertinent to the County management of the property, because that's the corridor you travel to Hearst Lake. The natural corridor [to Hearst Lake] is not on the Garrity addition.
- [inaudible]
- But really going up from the church is what makes the most sense, . . . as opposed to going through . . .

**6? Loshesky? (start @ 24.25)**

- It doesn't matter anyways, what . . . wrong way anyways . . .

**7. Gary Ouldhouse (start @ 25:17)**

- I'm with Anaconda Sportsmen's Club.
- I definitely want to see this purchase happen for two reasons; one is we will still maintain access to properties as we've had for years, and 2<sup>nd</sup> is it's really important to keep that wildlife corridor from Garrity Mountain over to Foster Mountain--to keep that . . .
- I'm not opposed to modernization [inaudible]; we've had a lot of that. Every, every, every time we've got less places to walk and more gates to open.
- Although, it's been said, that if there's a gate to be opened, I can get it open before you can close it; it's not a problem.

**8. Chuck Otto (start @ 26:40)**

- I purchased what's left of the Brickly Ranch headquarters buildings; I'm an adjacent landowner.
- Fully support this purchase; I like a lot of the management objectives
- Want to make sure that weed suppression continues, being an adjacent landowner that's the key thing. I see you applied for \$80,000 start-up costs, but if there's any way to keep that going, it's important. There's a 7-year seed viability rate so it's going to have to be a continuous program for awhile.
- Fire suppression--I believe in fire *management*; really don't think a strict fire suppression policy is what's needed on this property. And if there's anyone who should be worried about fire on Garrity, it's me as adjacent landowner. But we need some sort of option for fire generation in the future, especially spring time burns. Would support that.
- There are ATVs and motorcycles going up/down the road all day long. Being so close to Anaconda, if you open it up to motorized, then that's going to be continuous use and a problem in the future.
- A lot of these areas are closed, because they used to ALL be open--we used to be able to go anywhere we wanted--a lot of you guys remember that. When people can go anywhere they want, they end up not taking care of the resource. Trails get pushed into areas where they don't belong. If this property is being purchased for elk habitat, then elk need to be the number one priority out there. Elk and vehicles just don't mix very well. AND they don't mix with adjacent landowners either. I'd like to make sure that if you get this property, it be non-motorized.
- Overall your management plan looks like it's pretty solid. I like the fact that you've recognized that I have water rights out there also; so I don't think that's going to be a conflict at all.

**9. Lorry Thomas (start @ 29:38)**

- President of Anaconda Sportsmen's Club; we heartily support this 100% and I'll tell you one . . .  
[end of recording; @ 29:45]

**10. Darrell Baker (dropped off a written comment at the public meeting)**

- Need more for disabled.